

JAMES R. WILLIAMS, County Counsel (S.B. #271253)  
 GRETA S. HANSEN (S.B. #251471)  
 L. JAVIER SERRANO (S.B. #252266)  
 OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL  
 70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, Ninth Floor  
 San José, California 95110-1770  
 Telephone: (408) 299-5900  
 Facsimile: (408) 292-7240

Attorneys for Plaintiff

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
 FRANCISCO,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, *et al.*,  
 Defendants.

**STIPULATION AND  
 FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER**

No. 3:17-cv-00485-WHO

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA,  
 Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, *et al.*,  
 Defendants.

No. 3:17-cv-00574-WHO

WHEREAS, the underlying actions commenced as cases styled *City and County of San Francisco v. Trump* (No. 3:17-cv-00485-WHO) and *County of Santa Clara v. Trump* (No. 3:17-cv-00574-WHO), hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Litigation,” asserting claims challenging the constitutionality of Section 9 of Executive Order Number 13768, entitled “Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States” (“Section 9”);

WHEREAS, on November 20, 2017, the United States District Court for the Northern District of California granted summary judgment in favor of Plaintiffs on these claims and entered a permanent, nationwide injunction barring enforcement of Section 9;

1 WHEREAS, on August 1, 2018, in the Litigation upon appeal, the United States Court of  
 2 Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed the District Court's grant of summary judgement and  
 3 injunction as to the Executive Order's effect in California but vacated the nationwide injunction for  
 4 further consideration by the District Court (*see City and County of San Francisco v. Trump*, 897  
 5 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2018)); and

6 WHEREAS, the constitutionality of Section 9 is not currently being actively litigated  
 7 elsewhere in the nation and the Parties wish to avoid the need to expend further resources on  
 8 resolving these issues,

9 WHEREAS, assuming approval by the Court of the joint Stipulation and Final Judgment, the  
 10 pending Case Management Conference scheduled for August 20, 2019 may be cancelled as moot,

11 NOW THEREFORE, the parties hereby jointly stipulate to the following:

- 12 1. Final Judgment is hereby entered in favor of the Plaintiffs on the merits for the  
 13 reasons set forth in *City and County of San Francisco v. Trump*, 897 F.3d 1225 (9th  
 14 Cir. 2018);
- 15 2. All Parties agree that the deadline for further review of the Ninth Circuit's August 1,  
 16 2018 decision has passed. Out of an abundance caution, however, the Parties agree  
 17 that Defendants shall not seek to pursue any further review from (1) the Ninth  
 18 Circuit's decision of August 1, 2018, or (2) the final judgments entered in these cases.
- 19 3. The enforcement of Section 9 within the State of California is hereby enjoined;
- 20 4. Plaintiffs withdraw, without prejudice, their request for injunctive relief that would  
 21 reach outside the State of California;
- 22 5. For the sake of clarity, nothing in this dismissal precludes Plaintiffs from seeking to  
 23 renew their request for injunctive relief outside of the State of California by  
 24 reopening this matter. In the event that Plaintiffs seek to re-open the above  
 25 referenced cases, Defendants agree that any statute of limitations, statute of repose, or  
 26 other time-related defense based on federal, state or any other law (including, but not  
 27 limited to, defenses based on the doctrines of waiver, laches, acquiescence, or  
 28 estoppel) that may be applicable to any of the claims asserted by Plaintiffs will be

1           deemed tolled. However, nothing in this dismissal precludes the United States from  
2           defending the merits of such a request; and

3         6.       Each party in these actions will bear its own costs and attorney's fees.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Respectfully submitted,

DENNIS J. HERRERA (CA Bar #139669)  
City Attorney  
JESSE C. SMITH (CA Bar #122517)  
Chief Assistant City Attorney  
RONALD P. FLYNN (CA Bar #184186)  
Chief Deputy City Attorney  
YVONNE R. MERÉ (CA Bar #173594)  
Chief of Complex and Affirmative Litigation

JOSEPH H. HUNT  
Assistant Attorney General  
DAVID L. ANDERSON  
United States Attorney  
JOHN R. TYLER  
Assistant Director

/s/ Sara J. Eisenberg  
SARA J. EISENBERG (CA Bar #269303)  
TARA M. STEELEY (CA Bar #231775)  
AILEEN M. McGRATH, (CA Bar #280846)  
Deputy City Attorneys

/s/ Daniel D. Mauler  
DANIEL D. MAULER  
(Va. Bar #73190)  
Trial Attorney

City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4602  
Telephone: (415) 554-4748  
Facsimile: (415) 554-4715  
E-Mail: [brittany.feitelberg@sfgov.org](mailto:brittany.feitelberg@sfgov.org)

Department of Justice, Civil Division  
P.O. Box 883  
Washington, DC 20044  
Telephone: (202) 616-0773  
Facsimile: (202) 616-8470  
E-mail: [dan.mauler@usdoj.gov](mailto:dan.mauler@usdoj.gov)

#### COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
FRANCISCO

DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the  
United States; UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA; KEVIN K. McALEENAN,  
Acting Secretary of Homeland Security;  
WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General of  
the United States in *City & County of San  
Francisco v. Trump, et al.*, No. 3:17-cv-  
00485-WHO

\* \* \*

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL,  
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

JAMES R. WILLIAMS  
County Counsel

DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the  
United States; KEVIN K. McALEENAN,  
Acting Secretary of Homeland Security;  
WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General of  
the United States; MICK MULVANEY,  
Director of the Office of Management and  
Budget in *County of Santa Clara v. Trump,  
et al.*, No. 3:17-cv-00574-WHO

/s/ Javier Serrano  
JAVIER SERRANO (CA Bar #252266)  
Deputy County Counsel

70 West Hedding Street  
East Wing, Ninth Floor  
San Jose, CA 95110-1770  
Telephone: (408) 299-5900  
Facsimile: (408) 292-7240  
E-mail: [javier.serrano@cco.sccgov.org](mailto:javier.serrano@cco.sccgov.org)

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF  
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA


**ORDER**

It appearing to the Court that the parties jointly request the following relief, it is hereby  
 ORDRED as follows:

1. Final Judgment is hereby entered in favor of the Plaintiffs on the merits for the reasons set forth in *City and County of San Francisco v. Trump*, 897 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2018);
2. All Parties agree that the deadline for further review of the Ninth Circuit's August 1, 2018 decision has passed. Out of an abundance caution, however, the Parties agree that Defendants shall not seek to pursue any further review from (1) the Ninth Circuit's decision of August 1, 2018, or (2) the final judgments entered in these cases.
3. The enforcement of Section 9 within the State of California is hereby ENJOINED;
4. Plaintiffs' request for injunctive relief that would reach outside the State of California is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE;
5. For the sake of clarity, this dismissal does not Plaintiffs' rights to seek to renew their request for injunctive relief outside of the State of California by reopening this matter. In the event that Plaintiffs seek to re-open the above referenced cases, Defendants agree that any statute of limitations, statute of repose, or other time-related defense based on federal, state or any other law (including, but not limited to, defenses based on the doctrines of waiver, laches, acquiescence, or estoppel) that may be applicable to any of the claims asserted by Plaintiffs will be deemed tolled. However, nothing in this dismissal precludes the United States from defending the merits of such a request; and
6. Each party in these actions shall bear its own costs and attorney's fees.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: August 15, 2019

  
 Hon. William H. Orrick  
 United States District Judge

**ATTESTATION OF SIGNATURES**

I, Javier Serrano, hereby attest, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5-1(i)(3) of the Northern District of California, that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

/s/ Javier Serrano  
JAVIER SERRANO (CA Bar #252266)  
COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF

2064573